UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,468	04/01/2004	Ryan E.T. Sanders	110172.403	8409

500 7590 02/07/2008

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 5400
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER	
PACHOL, NICHOLAS C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/816,468	SANDERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas C. Pachol	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/17/04.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 12-16 claim "an article of manufacture ..." However, the claims do not define an *article of manufacture* to be a functional descriptive material encoded on a memory/disk/computer-readable medium, and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e.; "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized"). Moreover, "and article of manufacture" is neither a process ("action"), nor machine, nor manufacture, nor composition of matter (i.e., tangible "thing") and therefore non-statutory.

Such claimed "article of manufacture" does not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program' s functionality to be realized. As such, "article of manufacture", not claimed as embodied/encoded in computer-readable medium and is not statutory because the "article of manufacture" is not capable of causing functional change in the computer. Because the full scope of the claim as properly read in light of the disclosure encompasses non-statutory subject matter, the claim as a whole is non-statutory and appears to be one type of claim that is considered

nonstatutory, under the present USPTO Interim Guidelines, 1300 Official Gazette Patent and Trademark Office 142 (Nov. 22, 2005).

The Examiner suggests amending the claim to include the disclosed tangible computer readable media, while at the same time *excluding* the intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, etc...

Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-20, and 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferlitsch (US 2004/0190042) in view of Hansen (US 6407820).

Regarding Claim 1, Ferlitsch teaches a method (Page 2, paragraph 13), comprising:

receiving a print job that requests to print a set of electronic document pages that are available from a communication network (Page 5, paragraphs 55 and 57);

breaking up the print job into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together comprise the set of electronic document pages (Page 7, paragraphs 76 and 77).

Ferlitsch does not teach applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch; and

separately sending each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal to print, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them.

However, Hansen does teach applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch (Column 10, lines 42-64); and

separately sending each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal to print, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them (Column 8, line 63- Column 9, line 10, where since the job is already broken up into batches to make up separate jobs based on Ferlitsch).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 2, Ferlitsch further teaches logging print job status information as electronic document pages of each batch are stamped and sent to the client terminal

(Page 10, paragraph 110, where the network print queue is the files that are ready to be printed, and since the files need to be stamped first, based on Hansen, then the files that are already stamped are the ones in the print queue).

Regarding Claim 3, Ferlitsch further teaches if an interruption occurs during printout of electronic document pages of a batch (Page 11, paragraph 141):

checking the logged print job status information to determine which batch was last successfully printed (Page 11, paragraph 141); and

re-starting the print job at a batch subsequent to the batch that was last successfully printed, instead of re-starting the print job from its beginning first batch (Page 11, paragraph 141, where each batch is considered a print job).

Regarding Claim 4, Ferlitsch further teaches receiving a poll from the client terminal that requests transmission of electronic document pages that have been stamped (Page 8, paragraph 81, where since the documents that are ready to be printed have already been stamped based on the combination with Hansen);

sending the requested stamped electronic document pages to the client terminal, the requested stamped electronic document pages sent to the client terminal comprising less than a complete batch (Page 2, paragraph 17).

Regarding Claim 5, Ferlitsch in view of Hansen teaches receiving a download request for another set of electronic document pages (Ferlitsch: Page 7, paragraphs 76

and 77, where the download request is considered any request for a print job across the network);

breaking up the download request into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together comprise the another set of electronic document pages (Ferlitsch: Page 7, paragraphs 76 and 77);

applying stamps to these electronic document pages of each batch (Hansen: Column 10, lines 42-64); and

separately sending each of these batches having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to the client terminal, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them (Hansen: Column 8, line 63- Column 9, line 10, where since the job is already broken up into batches to make up separate jobs based on Ferlitsch).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 7, Ferlitsch further teaches determining whether a printer executable component to manage flow of the received stamped electronic document pages to a print spooler is present at the client terminal (Page 6, paragraph 66);

if the printer executable component is determined to not be present, downloading and installing the printer executable component in the client terminal (Page 6, paragraph 66); and

launching the printer executable component if a print job is generated (Page 6, paragraph 66, where the installation is launching the executable).

Regarding Claim 8, Hansen further teaches storing print job data, including template information usable for applying the stamps to the electronic document pages, at a first server remote from the client terminal (Figure 1, element 118 and Column 6, lines 26-33 and Column 10, lines 64-66);

if the print job is generated, providing at least some of the print job data to the client terminal (Figure 1, element 116 and Column 6, lines 16-26);

at a second server, receiving the print job data from the client terminal and obtaining template information corresponding to the print job data from the first server (Figure 1, element 120 and Column 7, lines 42-55).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 10, Hansen generating stamping statistics indicative of either one or both of which electronic document pages have been stamped and an amount of electronic document pages that have been stamped (Column 8, line 64-Column 9, line 3, since the documents that need to be stamped are shown in the preflight stage, then once they are stamped they are sent to the production staged and ready to be ready. By this, the documents that are in the print queue are the documents that have been stamped).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 12, Ferlitsch teaches an article of manufacture (Page 4, paragraph 43, where article of manufacture is considered a program) usable in a communication network (Page 4, paragraph 42), the article of manufacture comprising:

a machine-readable medium having instructions stored thereon (Paragraph 43) to:

process a download request for a set of electronic document pages (Page 5, paragraph 54);

reduce the download request into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together comprise the set of electronic document pages (Page 7, paragraph 77).

Ferlitsch does not teach apply stamps to the electronic document pages of each batch; and

separately send each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal communicatively coupled to the communication network, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them.

However Hansen does teach apply stamps to the electronic document pages of each batch (Column 10, lines 42-64); and

separately send each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal communicatively coupled to the communication network, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them (Column 8, line 63- Column 9, line 10, where since the job is already broken up into batches to make up separate jobs based on Ferlitsch).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 13, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the instructions to process the download request include instructions to process a print job (Page 6, paragraph 59).

Regarding Claim 14, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the machine- readable medium further includes instructions stored thereon to log print job status information as electronic document pages of each batch are stamped and sent to the client terminal (Page 5, paragraph 56, where the print queue logs information about the print jobs).

Regarding Claim 15, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the machine- readable medium further includes instructions stored thereon to:

if an interruption occurs during printout of electronic document pages of a batch, check the logged print job status information to determine which batch was last successfully printed (Page 11, paragraph 141); and

re-start the print job at a batch subsequent to the batch that was last successfully printed, instead of re-starting the print job from its beginning first batch (Page 11, paragraph 141, where each batch is considered a print job).

Regarding Claim 16, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the machine- readable medium further includes instructions stored thereon to:

detect a poll from the client terminal that requests transmission of electronic document pages that have been stamped (Page 8, paragraph 81, where since the

documents that are ready to be printed have already been stamped based on the combination with Hansen);

send the requested stamped electronic document pages to the client terminal, the requested stamped electronic document pages sent to the client terminal comprising less than a complete batch (Page 2, paragraph 17).

Regarding Claim 17, Ferlitsch teaches a system (Page 2, paragraph 13) comprising:

a printer executable component to control download of remote electronic files to a printer (Page 3, paragraph 39, where the firmware is the executable component);

Ferlitsch does not teach a server communicatively coupled to the printer executable component to store print job data; and

at least one stamping service in communication with both the server and the printer executable component, wherein if the printer executable component is launched to initiate a print job, the printer executable component is coupled to obtain at least some of the stored print job data from the server and to provide this obtained print job data to the stamping service, the printer executable component being capable to use the print job data provided by the printer executable component to obtain stamps from the server that are to be applied to a set of electronic files and to break up the print job into multiple batches having a plurality of pages that together comprise the set of electronic files, the printer executable component being further capable to apply the stamps to pages of each batch and to download the pages having stamps applied

thereon to either one or both the printer executable component and the printer while pages of other batches are being stamped.

However, Hansen does teach a server communicatively coupled to the printer executable component to store print job data (Column 6, lines 26-33); and

at least one stamping service in communication with both the server and the printer executable component (Column 10, lines 48-52), wherein if the printer executable component is launched to initiate a print job, the printer executable component is coupled to obtain at least some of the stored print job data from the server and to provide this obtained print job data to the stamping service (Column 10, lines 54-64), the printer executable component being capable to use the print job data provided by the printer executable component to obtain stamps from the server that are to be applied to a set of electronic files and to break up the print job into multiple batches having a plurality of pages that together comprise the set of electronic files, the printer executable component being further capable to apply the stamps to pages of each batch and to download the pages having stamps applied thereon to either one or both the printer executable component and the printer while pages of other batches are being stamped (Column 8, line 63- Column 9, line 10, where since the job is already broken up into batches to make up separate jobs based on Ferlitsch).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 18, Hansen further teaches a plurality of stamping services, each stamping service being capable to stamp pages of batches corresponding to a same print job (Column 10, lines 52-57).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 19, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the printer executable component is capable to poll the stamping service to request pages that have been stamped (Page 8, paragraph 81, where since the documents that are ready to be printed have already been stamped based on the combination with Hansen), the stamping service being further capable to send the requested pages, which may comprise less than all pages in a batch (Page 2, paragraph 17).

Regarding Claim 20, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the stamping service is capable to provide print job updates to the server, wherein the printer executable

component can access the print job updates at the server to re-start the print job in case of interruption, at a batch subsequent to a batch that was last successfully printed, instead of a re-start of the print job from a first batch (Page 11, paragraph 141, where each batch is considered a print job).

Regarding Claim 23, Hansen further teaches a stamping data store in communication with the stamping service to store stamping statistics that can be provided by the stamping service (Column 8, line 64-Column 9, line 3, since the documents that need to be stamped are shown in the preflight stage, then once they are stamped they are sent to the production staged and ready to be ready. By this, the documents that are in the print queue are the documents that have been stamped).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 24, Hansen further teaches wherein the server can request print preview information from the stamping service, the stamping service being capable to provide the preview information as a representation of a page having stamps applied thereto, the server being able to subsequently provide the preview information to the printer executable component (Column 10, lines 54-64).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 25, Hansen further teaches further comprising at least another executable component, including a download executable component to control storage of stamped pages of batches to a storage unit (Column 6, lines 26-33).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 26, Hansen further teaches comprising a plurality of user interface usable to perform at least one of create a template having the stamps, assign Bates number formats to the electronic files, identify a print job, view print job status information, select a location to save the stamped pages, and select a printer to print the stamped pages (Column 10, line 41- Column 11 line 2).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 27, Ferlitsch further teaches further comprising another server to download the printer executable component to a client terminal if the printer executable component is not installed in the client terminal if the print job is initiated (Page 6, paragraph 66).

Regarding Claim 28, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the printer executable component is downloaded to be installed as part of a browser application on the client terminal (Page 6, paragraph 66, from a web-site constitutes part of a browser application).

Regarding Claim 29, Ferlitsch teaches a system (Page 2, paragraph 13) comprising:

a means for receiving a print job that requests to print a set of electronic document pages that are available from a communication network (Page 5, paragraphs 55 and 57);

a means for breaking up the print job into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together comprise the set of electronic document pages (Page 7, paragraphs 76 and 77).

Ferlitsch does not teach a means for applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch;

and a means for separately sending each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal to print, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them.

However, Hansen does teach a means for applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch (Column 10, lines 42-64);

and a means for separately sending each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal to print, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them (Column 8, line 63- Column 9, line 10, where since the job is already broken up into batches to make up separate jobs based on Ferlitsch).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 30, Ferlitsch in view of Hansen further teaches a means for storing the electronic document pages and associated metadata, including template information having the stamps that can be applied to the electronic document pages (Hansen: Column 6, lines 26-33 and Column 10, lines 64-66);

a means for querying for and returning corresponding data results associated with stored electronic document pages that can be stamped (Hansen: Column 9, lines 23-30);

a means for providing preview information of electronic document pages showing stamps applied thereto (Hansen: 57-66); and

a means for downloading executable files to the client terminal if the executable files are not yet installed in the client terminal when the print job is initiated (Ferlitsch: Page 6, paragraph 66).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 31, Hansen further teaches a means for updating print job status information and for keeping stamping statistics (Column 8, line 64-Column 9, line 3, since the documents that need to be stamped are shown in the preflight stage, then once they are stamped they are sent to the production staged and ready to be ready. By this, the documents that are in the print queue are the documents that have been stamped).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 32, Hansen further comprising means for downloading batches having stamped electronic document pages for purposes different from printing (Column 6, lines 26-33 and Figure 1, element 118, where saving the document is different from printing).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 33, Ferlitsch further teaches a means for polling to identify and obtain electronic document pages of a batch that have been stamped and that can be printed (Page 8, paragraph 81, where since the documents that are ready to be printed have already been stamped based on the combination with Hansen), wherein such electronic document pages comprise less than a full batch (Page 2, paragraph 17).

Regarding Claim 34, Hansen further teaches user interface means for creating templates (Column 10, lines 54-66) and for initiating print jobs (Column 12, line 62-Column 13, line 10).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferlitsch (US 2004/0190042) in view of Hansen (US 6,407,820) further in view of Lutz (US 2005/0076298).

Regarding Claim 6 Ferlitsch in view of Hansen does not teach wherein receiving the download request comprises receiving a request to store the requested set of electronic document pages in a storage unit.

However, Lutz does teach wherein receiving the download request comprises receiving a request to store the requested set of electronic document pages in a storage unit (Page 2, paragraph 9).

Ferlitsch in view of Hansen and Lutz are combinable because they all manage print jobs.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch in view of Hansen with Lutz to decrease the amount of time it takes to process a print job (Lutz: Page 1, paragraph 6).

5. Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferlitsch (US 2004/0190042) in view of Hansen (US 6,407,820) further in view of Kremer (US 2004/0158655).

Regarding Claim 9, Ferlitsch in view of Hansen does not teach making a temporary copy of the each electronic document page, wherein applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch includes applying stamps to the temporary copies.

However, Kremer does teach making a temporary copy of the each electronic document page, wherein applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch includes applying stamps to the temporary copies (Page 6, paragraph 45, where Ferlitsch has already broken up the document into different batches).

Ferlitsch in view of Hansen and Kremer are combinable because they all manage print jobs across a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch in view of Hansen with Kremer for maintaining an additional copy of the print job (Page 7, paragraph 51).

Regarding Claim 22, Hansen further teaches a first server unit to store indexed content of the electronic files (Figure 1, element 120 and Column 7, lines 42-55);

a second server unit to store metadata content of the electronic files, the metadata content including stamps that can be obtained by the stamping service and applied to pages of the electronic files (Figure 1, element 118 and Column 6, lines 26-33).

Ferlitsch and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Ferlitsch in view of Hansen does not teach a third server unit to store the pages of the electronic files, the stamping service being capable to obtain a/temporary copy of the stored pages and to apply the stamps thereto.

However, Kremer does teach a third server unit to store the pages of the electronic files, the stamping service being capable to obtain a/temporary copy of the stored pages and to apply the stamps thereto (Page 6, paragraph 45).

Ferlitsch in view of Hansen and Kremer are combinable because they all manage print jobs across a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch in view of Hansen with Kremer for maintaining an additional copy of the print job (Page 7, paragraph 51).

6. Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferlitsch (US 2004/0190042) in view of Hansen (US 6,407,820) further in view of Shaw (US 5,602,974).

Regarding Claim 11, Ferlitsch in view of Hansen does not teach printing the stamped electronic document pages asynchronously from other applications running on the client terminal.

However, Shaw teaches printing the stamped electronic document pages asynchronously from other applications running on the client terminal (Column 9, lines 39-40).

Ferlitsch in view of Hansen and Shaw are combinable because they all deal with processing print jobs.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch in view of Hansen with the teachings of Shaw to allow the print jobs to be more quickly spooled that conventional systems (Column 9, lines 17-39).

Regarding Claim 21, Ferlitsch in view of Hansen does not teach wherein the printer executable component operates asynchronously of client applications.

However, Shaw does teach wherein the printer executable component operates asynchronously of client applications (Column 9, lines 39-40).

Ferlitsch in view of Hansen and Shaw are combinable because they all deal with processing print jobs.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ferlitsch in view of Hansen with the teachings of Shaw to allow the print jobs to be more quickly spooled that conventional systems (Column 9, lines 17-39).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T, 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP
02/01/08

TWYLER LAMB HASKINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER